

Postal Regulatory Commission
Chairwoman Ruth Y. Goldway's Office
901 New York Avenue NW, Suite 200
Washington, DC 20268-0001

April 22, 2014

Dear Chairwoman Goldway,

It recently came to our attention that the Postal Regulatory Commission (PRC) dismissed an important complaint that the American Postal Workers Union (APWU) lodged against the U.S. Postal Service (USPS) in docket C2013-10. This docket is concerned with whether the USPS violated its own service standards, and the regulations that dictate them.

Put aside whether the USPS's service standards are actually meeting the needs of their nationwide customers, ensuring uniform, universal service, at even adequate levels. The APWU has documented that the U.S. Postal Service is failing to meet its own service standards. These service standards were established in accordance with 39 U.S.C. § 3691, in order to meet the objectives laid out in that section. If the service standards which are designed to ensure the USPS meets its objectives in 39 U.S.C. § 3691 are not upheld, then the integrity of that section of law is threatened.

That the PRC explains its dismissal of the APWU's claim on the basis that 39 U.S.C. § 3691 does not dictate the enforcement of service standards misses the point. The service standards are supposed to meet the objectives contained therein. It is disappointing that the Postal Regulatory Commission does not see this issue, has not allowed the APWU an opportunity for discovery, and instead dismissed their complaint.

Also, that the PRC could rule that deliveries made after their intended delivery time does not constitute an adequate harm or injury is dismaying. This is a violation of the USPS's own service standards; the standards their customers expect when they use the USPS's services. The customer has provided monetary compensation for the delivery of their piece of mail according to the service standards that the USPS promulgates. If the USPS does not meet those standards, the customer does not receive the quality of service for which they paid. This, alone, is a harm or injury.

But that doesn't even consider any further harm or injury that could be caused by the delayed delivery of what is contained in the piece of mail itself. If contained therein was medicine or a time sensitive business document, there could be further physical or monetary harm or injury to the customer due to the delay resulting from the USPS's failure to meet its own service standards.

It is disappointing that the PRC does not consider the initial complaint justification enough for a proceeding. What is to stop the USPS from further violating other service standards or enacted laws if the Commission won't grant complaints like the one advanced by the APWU? Where is the oversight that the PRC is supposed to provide over the USPS? I hope that you consider these points and reconsider your ruling on docket C2013-10.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ralph Nader", written in a cursive style.

Ralph Nader

P. O. Box 19312
Washington, D.C. 20036
202-387-8030